

## REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 9, and 12 were rejected under Section 102(e) as being anticipated by Kuchi. It is not conceded that Kuchi represents prior invention. However, Kuchi does not teach enabling control over future transmission patterns of the channel using channel prediction terms.

The office action, in paragraph 1, indicates that control over future transmission patterns of the channel is enabled using the channel prediction terms SIS 2 and exhibited in Figure 5. But Figure 5 is explicitly explained as being a receiver. There is no indication that anything in Figure 5 has any effect over future transmission. For example, in column 8, lines 59 *et seq.* it is explained that the structure in Figure 5 is a receiver. The item SIS 2 is simply the received symbols.

Thus, it does not appear that there is any basis for deducing that anything in Figure 5 is used to enable control over future transmission patterns of the channel using channel prediction terms. Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

On the same basis, reconsideration is requested of the rejection of claim 15 and its dependent claims. Likewise, reconsideration of claim 22 and its dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In view of these remarks, the application may now be in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 8, 2004



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100  
Houston, TX 77024  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]